

## Old Dominion University ODU Digital Commons

---

Psychology Theses & Dissertations

Psychology


---

Spring 2007

# Authoritarianism, Hostility Toward Women, Attitudes Toward Violence, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Sexual Aggression

Gina M. Bondi  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds)

 Part of the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#), [Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bondi, Gina M.. "Authoritarianism, Hostility Toward Women, Attitudes Toward Violence, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Sexual Aggression" (2007). Master of Science (MS), thesis, Psychology, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/vgse-h041  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds/95](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds/95)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

**AUTHORITARIANISM, HOSTILITY TOWARD WOMEN, ATTITUDES TOWARD  
VIOLENCE, RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE, AND SEXUAL AGGRESSION**

by

Gina M. Bondi  
B.S. August 2003, James Madison University

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirement for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

PSYCHOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY  
May, 2007

Approved by:

Michelle L. Kelley (Director) 

---

Barbara A. Winstead (Member)

---

Carryl L. Baldwin (Member)

## ABSTRACT

### AUTHORITARIANISM, HOSTILITY TOWARD WOMEN, ATTITUDES TOWARD VIOLENCE, RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE, AND SEXUAL AGGRESSION

Gina M. Bondi  
Old Dominion University, 2007  
Director: Dr. Michelle L. Kelley

Almost one out of every five women has been, or will have been, the victim of sexual aggression and/or rape in their lives (National Institute of Justice, 2000). This staggering statistic exemplifies the importance of speculating which traits are related to, or are predictive of, sexually aggressive behavior. Based on previous research, the current study investigated relationships between authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance, as related sexual aggression in undergraduate men. It was projected that authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance would significantly and positively predict all dimensions of sexual aggression as measured by the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire including manipulative sexual behavior, coercive sexual behavior, sexual assault, attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape.

Respondents were 67 male college students who attended a large public university in southeastern Virginia. Participants completed the Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer, 1981), the Hostility Toward Women Scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995), the Attitudes Toward Violence Scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995), the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980), the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Lisak & Roth, 1988; derived from the Sexual Experiences Survey, Koss & Oros, 1982), and a demographic information questionnaire.

Logistic regressions were performed to determine whether the aforementioned variables predicted men's endorsement of sexually aggressive behavior. Results of the logistic regressions revealed that rape myth acceptance was the only significant predictor of any subscale of sexual aggression examined. More specifically, rape myth acceptance significantly and positively predicted attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape; therefore, beliefs about rape appear closely related to behaviors that constitute rape. Results of the study as well as strengths and limitations are discussed in detail.

This thesis is dedicated to Nicholas, Sophia, and Lukas.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the guidance, dedication, patience, and invaluable input of my committee members Dr. Barbara Winstead and Dr. Carryl Baldwin. I extend especially deep appreciation to my thesis director, Dr. Michelle Kelley, for her untiring support and direction throughout the course of this research.

I would also like to thank my extended family and friends for providing me with the love, strength, and encouragement during the pursuit of my degrees. They always believed in me whole-heartedly, and they served as the loving support that was needed to achieve my personal and educational goals.

Finally, I would like to express infinite gratitude to my amazing parents for everything that they have done for me throughout my life and academic path. My mother's perseverance in achieving her doctorate as a working, full-time mom provided me with the inspiration to always strive for my potential. My father's selfless hard work in funding my education and his endless, altruistic mentoring has given me the inner strength necessary to accomplish my goals. I owe my deepest thanks to them.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
Section	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Authoritarianism.....	2
Attitudes Toward Violence.....	4
Hostility Toward Women.....	5
Rape Myth Acceptance and Sexually Aggressive Behavior .....	7
Hypotheses .....	10
II. METHOD.....	12
Participants .....	12
Overview of Measures.....	14
Procedure.....	20
III. RESULTS. ....	23
Preliminary Analyses.....	23
Categorization of Sexual Aggression .....	23
Hypothesis Testing .....	26
IV. DISCUSSION .....	36
Study Strengths.....	39
Study Limitations .....	40
Future Research .....	41
V. CONCLUSION.....	43
REFERENCES .....	44
APPENDICES	
A. Participant Notification Form .....	50
B. Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer, 1988).....	54
C. Hostility Toward Women Scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) .....	58
D. Attitudes Toward Violence Scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995).....	59
E. Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980) .....	61
F. Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Lisak & Roth, 1988).....	63
G. Demographic Questionnaire .....	68
VITA .....	69

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequencies and Percentiles for Participant Demographics.....	12
2. Descriptive Statistics for Predictor Variables .....	24
3. Correlations Among Predictor Variables.....	24
4. Frequencies of Participants Categorized as Having Engaged in Each Form of Sexually Aggressive Behavior Based on Responses to the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) .....	25
5. Standard Logistic Regression for Manipulative Sexual Behavior .....	27
6. Standard Logistic Regression for Coercive Sexual Behavior.....	29
7. Standard Logistic Regression for Sexual Assault.....	30
8. Standard Logistic Regression for Attempted Rape.....	32
9. Standard Logistic Regression for Rape.....	33
10. Standard Logistic Regression for Fantasy Rape .....	35



## INTRODUCTION

One of the most important criminal justice concerns in the United States is sexual victimization. Sexual victimization is defined as any form of sexually aggressive behavior, including, but not limited to, the crime of rape (Breitenbecher, 2000). More specifically, the National Institute of Justice (2000) reported that 17.6% of all women in the United States have been the victims of a completed or attempted rape at some point in their lives. Men are overwhelmingly the perpetrators of sexual aggression (Hall, Hirshman, Graham, & Zaragoza, 1993). In a nationally representative survey of college students, 4.4% of male undergraduate students reported perpetrating, since the age of 14, an act that met the legal definition of rape (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Undoubtedly, personality characteristics, attitudes, and previous experiences play a role in the sexual behavior of undergraduate men.

Given the frequency with which women experience sexual victimization, and the small, but significant minority of men that perpetrate these behaviors, it is important to investigate attitudes and behaviors that may be related to experiences of sexually aggressive behaviors toward women (i.e., manipulative sexual behavior, coercive sexual behavior, sexual assault, attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape). Investigating these relationships may contribute to the development of prevention programs or treatment for men who perpetrate sexually aggressive behaviors. The present study examined the relationships between authoritarian beliefs, attitudes toward violence, hostility toward women, rape myth acceptance, and previous experiences of sexual aggression among

---

The format for this thesis follows the *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*.

male college students attending a large southeastern university. Although previous research has focused on predictors of men's behaviors that constitute rape, the present study assessed relationships between the aforementioned variables and various types of sexually aggressive behavior.

### *Authoritarianism*

Authoritarianism is defined as a strong reverence for those who are in positions of authority, respect for traditional morals and values, and hostility toward out-groups when the higher authority encourages this resentment (Whitley, 1999). Authoritarianism as determined by the California F Scale (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) is common among male and female college freshmen (Badgett et al., 1974). Epstein (1965) studied the relationship between aggression and variables such as gender and authoritarianism, by examining aggression in subjects administering shocks during a learning task. The results of the study concluded that those individuals who reported higher authoritarianism showed more overall aggression in administering the shocks to the targets than those who reported lower authoritarianism. Results of the Epstein study imply that people who endorse more authoritarian qualities are more likely to be aggressive than those who endorse fewer authoritarian attributes.

Authoritarianism has also been linked to sexually aggressive behavior (Walker, Rowe, & Quinsey, 1993). Specifically, Walker and colleagues surveyed 204 males, both attending college and not, ages 18 and older. The participants were administered surveys that assessed authoritarianism, hostility toward women, sex role ideology, acceptance of interpersonal violence, adversarial sexual beliefs, rape myth acceptance, and sexual experience/aggression scales. Authoritarianism (as measured by the Right-Wing

Authoritarianism Scale, Altemeyer, 1981) was significantly and positively related to hostility toward women, rape myth acceptance, and sexual aggression. Walker et al. demonstrated that authoritarian beliefs predicted past sexual aggression in young men. In addition, Walker and colleagues used the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) to examine men's sexual behavior. Importantly, men did not report socially desirable answers on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. The results of Koss and Oros' study suggest that the Sexual Experiences survey is a reasonable measure of participant's past sexually aggressive behavior. Similar relationships between right-wing authoritarianism and sexually aggressive behavior are expected in the present study of college males.

Begany and Milburn (2002) investigated authoritarianism as a predictor of sexual harassment and rape-supportive beliefs in male college students. They surveyed college males and assessed authoritarianism (as measured by the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale developed by Altemeyer, 1981), rape myth acceptance (as measured by the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale developed by Burt, 1980), sexual harassment, and sexism. They found that authoritarianism significantly and positively predicted the likelihood of engaging in sexual harassment. Furthermore, authoritarianism significantly and positively predicted higher acceptance of rape myths. The authors speculated that there was a possibility that the relationship between authoritarianism and sexual harassment was mediated by rape myth acceptance as well as negative/hostile sexism toward women. The current research sought to validate these findings in that higher authoritarianism would predict various levels of sexually aggressive behavior as it did sexual harassment in the aforementioned study.

### *Attitudes Toward Violence*

Importantly, attitudes toward violence may influence the degree of sexual violence that men report. Caron and Carter (1997) conducted a study that examined attitudes toward violence against women, sex role orientation, attitudes toward sexuality, and beliefs about rape, in college students. The authors concluded that attitudes toward violence predicted rape myth acceptance such that respondents who endorsed violence as being more acceptable also reported higher rape myth acceptance scores. Moreover, gender played a role in that men viewed the rapist less negatively, attributed more blame toward the victim, and were more tolerant of vignettes that depicted rape than were women. In support of the present study, it was anticipated that men who endorsed violence would also be more accepting of rape myths. Because men who endorse higher rape myth acceptance are also more likely to report sexually aggressive behavior (Forbes, Adams-Curtis, & White, 2004; Zielinski, 1996), it was speculated that men who reported greater rape myth acceptance might also endorse other forms of sexually aggressive behavior that have received less empirical attention such as coercive sexual behavior and/or manipulative sexual behavior.

Related to this, Lackie and deMan (1997) observed sex-role stereotyping, fraternity affiliation, hostility toward women, athletic participation, physical aggression, and aggressive attitudes in college males. The researchers assessed sexual aggression with the use of 12 items from the Sexual Experiences Survey by Koss and Oros, 1982, hostility toward women with the Hostility Toward Women scale (Check, 1985) and attitudes toward violence with six statements regarding acceptance of interpersonal violence (Burt, 1980). Lackie and deMan concluded that one's attitudes toward

interpersonal violence, in addition to previous physically aggressive behavior and sex role stereotyping, predicted sexually aggressive behavior. Based on previous research, one could contend that positive attitudes toward violence may be associated with manipulative sexual behavior, or sexual aggression. The current research aimed to confirm the relationship between positive attitudes toward violence and sexually aggressive behavior.

### *Hostility Toward Women*

An important question is whether hostility toward women is associated with sexually aggressive behavior. McCollaum and Lester (1997) examined the relationship between hostility toward women, hostility toward one's mother, and general hostility/aggression in relation to sexual aggression in college males. They employed the use of the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) and the Attitudes Toward Women scale by Spence and Helmreich (1972). The researchers concluded that hostility toward women in general, and toward one's mother, both contributed to sexually aggressive behavior. The McCollaum and Lester (1972) study suggests that hostile attitudes toward women may influence manipulative or aggressive sexual behavior toward women. Abbey and McAuslan (2004) conducted a similar study examining the relationship between callous attitudes toward women and sexual assault. Abbey and McAuslan (2004) utilized the more recent version of the Sexual Experiences Survey, the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Koss et al., 1987), in college males at two different times one year apart. Abbey and McAuslan (2004) concluded that those men who had sexually assaulted women scored higher on the measure of hostility toward women. The preceding research suggests that hostility toward women may contribute to sexual assault.

In addition to confirming relationships between authoritarianism and sexual aggression, the present research also attempted to confirm previous research that has identified hostility toward women as a factor that contributes to sexual aggression. It is possible that identifying adolescent or young men that have hostile attitudes toward women may be important for preventing sexually aggressive behaviors toward women.

In their study of male and female undergraduates, Hull and Burke (1991) found sexual experiences were associated with one's attitudes toward women (as measured by the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Specifically, individuals who had experienced or had been perpetrators of some form of serious sexually aggressive behavior had more negative attitudes toward women, and those who had perpetrated less severe levels of sexual abuse exhibited more positive attitudes toward women. The current research aimed to expand upon the earlier findings by Hull and Burke. Specifically, negative attitudes toward women (as measured by the Hostility Toward Women scale, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) were expected to be related to various forms of sexual aggression including manipulative and coercive sexual behavior in addition to sexual assault, attempted rape, and rape.

In a recent study, Forbes, Adams-Curtis, and White (2004) investigated how sexism and rape-supportive attitudes were related to sexual aggression/coercion. They measured these constructs with the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972), the Benevolent Sexism Scale, and the Hostile Sexism Scale (Glick & Fiske, 1996). They concluded that sexual aggression/coercion seemed to be based on negative attitudes toward women. Furthermore, sexist attitudes and rape-supportive attitudes were related to manipulative sexual behavior.

Christopher, Owens, and Stecker (1993) investigated hostility toward women as a predictor of two different forms of sexual aggression: antisocial acts and pressure/manipulation during dating. Other predictors of sexual aggression included acceptance of rape myths, adversarial sexual beliefs, and number of sexual partners. The researchers utilized the Hostility Toward Women Scale developed by Check, Malamuth, Elias, and Barton (1985), which is the original 30-item version of the scale. All of the variables examined significantly predicted pressure/manipulation in dating situations.

*Rape Myth Acceptance and Sexually Aggressive Behavior*

Several studies have examined whether rape myth acceptance scores are related to sexually aggressive behavior. Zielinski (1996) found that hostility toward women and rape myth acceptance (which were highly correlated) both were related to sexual aggression among men in college fraternities. Furthermore, rape myth acceptance predicted sexually aggressive behavior. Intuitively, hostility toward women and one's attitudes about rape could be related to sexual behavior. That is, rape-supportive beliefs paired with sexism and hostility toward women may increase the likelihood that one behaves in a way that combines negative views about women's sexual behavior with anger toward women.

In their 1998 study, Bohner et al. investigated rape myth acceptance and attraction toward sexual aggression in college males. They utilized Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and Malamuth's (1980) attraction toward sexual aggression scale. The results indicated that males who endorsed higher rape myths also exhibited higher proclivity for sexual aggression. Their results support the premise that men who endorse

higher acceptance of rape myths (blaming the victim and vindicating the rapist) may be more likely to engage in sexually aggressive behavior.

As previously mentioned, Walker et al. (1993) examined various predictors of sexual aggression in college males and men not attending college. Their study utilized the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale by Altemeyer (1988), the Hostility Toward Women scale by Check et al. (1985), the Sex Role Ideology Scale, and three scales by Burt (1980): Rape Myth Acceptance, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence, and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs. As previously noted, authoritarianism was a significant predictor of reports of sexual aggression in males. Furthermore, both rape myth acceptance and hostility toward women were significantly and positively correlated with sexually aggressive behavior.

*Malamuth's Confluence Model of Sexual Aggression.* Neil Malamuth has conducted extensive research identifying predictors of sexual aggression. In a 1986 study, he assessed whether hostility toward women, sexual arousal as a response to aggressive behavior, sexual dominance, psychoticism, sexual experiences, and positive attitudes toward violence would significantly and positively predicts sexual aggression. He concluded that most of the predictor variables were related to sexual aggression and that the predictive relationship was stronger when a number of variables were examined together in relation to sexual aggression (i.e., sexual aggression was more strongly predicted by hostility toward women and attitudes toward violence, rather than either variable alone). Related to this, Malamuth, Sockoloskie, Koss, and Tanaka (1991) examined additional characteristics of men who exhibit sexually aggressive behavior. In their study, hostile masculinity and sexual promiscuity significantly predicted sexual



aggression; hostile masculinity was measured by the constructs of adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility toward women, and negative masculinity. Furthermore, rape myth acceptance significantly contributed to the prediction of sexually aggressive behavior (as measured by the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale developed by Burt, 1980). It is plausible that examining hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance may strengthen the prediction of various forms of sexually aggressive behavior.

Malamuth and colleagues (1995) retested their confluence model of men's sexually aggressive behavior. Specifically, two major characteristics were examined: sexual promiscuity and hostile masculinity. In this study, hostile masculinity was measured by one's attitudes toward violence and one's acceptance of rape myths, as the authors wanted to utilize attitudes that were specifically about women (which was not the case in the former study). Similar to the earlier study, the results supported the contention that the prediction of men's reports of sexual aggression was strengthened when beliefs about rape myth acceptance were included in the model. In 1997, Dean and Malamuth further investigated their model of sexual aggression in men. Specifically, they examined whether the previous factors hypothesized to influence sexual aggression were related to imagined sexual aggression and fantasy rape. Dean and Malamuth (1997) concluded that attitudes toward violence and rape myth acceptance (measured with attitudes toward violence to represent hostile masculinity in their study) contributed to imagining sexual aggression in much the same way as it contributed to actual sexual aggression.

Given the possible implications of the previous research showing relationships among sexual experiences, attitudes toward women, and rape myth acceptance (Dean & Malamuth, 1997; Hull & Burke, 1991; Koss et al., 1985; Malamuth, 1986; Malamuth et al., 1991; Malamuth et al., 1995; Peterson & Franzese, 1987; Zielinski, 1996), clearly, additional research is needed to confirm the relationship between beliefs about rape and sexually aggressive behavior. A limitation of previous research has been the tendency to combine different forms of sexual aggression into a single sexual aggression outcome measure, or alternatively, to assess only a specific dimension of sexual aggression (e.g., rape). In contrast, the present study assesses the degree to which each of the variables of interest is associated with different types of sexual aggression. The forms of sexual aggression examined are those that are assessed by the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ; Lisak & Roth, 1988): manipulative sexual behavior, coercive sexual behavior, sexual assault, attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape.

### *Hypotheses*

The purpose of the present study was to examine associations among the predictor variables (authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes towards violence, and rape myth acceptance) and their contribution to group membership in one or more of the subscales of sexual aggression (manipulative sexual behavior, coercive sexual behavior, sexual assault, attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape). It was hypothesized that: the predictor variables would be related with one another as well as the outcome variable (as observed in previous research), and one or more of the predictor variables examined would contribute to group membership in each subscale of sexual aggression. Specifically, it was hypothesized that: 1) Authoritarianism, hostility toward women,

attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance would predict manipulative sexual behavior, 2) Authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance would predict coercive sexual behavior, 3) Authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance would predict sexual assault, 4) Authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance would predict attempted rape, 5) Authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance would predict rape, and 6) Authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance would predict fantasy rape.

## METHOD

*Participants*

The present study surveyed 67 college males enrolled in a large public university in southeastern Virginia. Participants either received credit for research participation or chose to participate without incentive. Originally, 71 questionnaires were collected; however, four were not used in the analyses due to at least one page per survey of missing data. Demographic information on the study participants is presented in Table 1. Convenience sampling was used; that is, students attending the university were offered the opportunity to participate. Participants were students who were recruited from two campus fraternity meetings (n=15), were a member of a campus club/organization (n=10), or were receiving research credit as part of an undergraduate psychology course (n=42). The participants were treated in accordance with the American Psychological Association's (2002) ethical guidelines; prior to data collection, approval was obtained from the College of Sciences Human Subjects Committee at Old Dominion University.

Table 1

*Frequencies and Percentiles for Participant Demographics*

Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)
Age (n=66)		
18-25	43	65.15
26-34	15	22.73

Table 1 continued.

Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)
35-44	5	7.58
45-older	3	4.55
Race/Ethnicity (n=65)		
White/Caucasian	36	55.38
Black/African American	13	20.00
Hispanic	3	4.62
Asian/Pacific Islander	10	15.38
Other	3	4.62
Marital Status (n=66)		
Single	50	75.76
Married	9	13.64
Divorced	1	1.52
Cohabiting	5	7.58
Separated	1	1.52
Childhood Parental Status (n=65)		
Parents Married	47	72.31
Parents Separated	4	6.15
Parents Divorced	12	18.46
Other	2	3.08

Table 1 continued.

Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)
Academic Status (n=66)		
Freshman	6	9.09
Sophomore	20	30.30
Senior	5	7.58
Graduate	25	37.89

Note. N=67; categories summing to 65 or 66 reflect missing demographic data

### *Overview of Measures*

The questionnaire packets distributed to the study participants included a description of the study (see Appendix A), the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale (Altemeyer, 1981; see Appendix B), the Hostility Toward Women scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995, derived from Check et al., 1985; see Appendix C), the Attitudes Toward Violence scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995, derived from Velicer, Huckel, & Hansen, 1989; see Appendix D), the Rape Myth Acceptance scale (Burt, 1980; see Appendix E), the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Lisak & Roth, 1988; see Appendix F), and a demographic information questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire included questions that assessed age, race/ethnicity, marital status, family status, and level of education (see Appendix G).

*Right-Wing Authoritarianism* (RWA; Altemeyer, 1988). The RWA scale is a 30-item measure that assesses three types of authoritarian attitudes: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism. Authoritarian submission measures acts of submission to people perceived as legitimate authorities of society. An example of a statement measuring authoritarian submission is as follows: “It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people’s minds.” Authoritarian aggression measures acts of aggression toward people that they perceive are sanctioned by those legitimate authorities of society. For example, “In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.” Items assessing conventionalism measured an individual’s adherence to the perceived social rules and principles held by society’s authorities. A sample item from this subscale is: “It may be considered old-fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman and, especially, a lady.” Items were scored on a 7-point Likert scale from: 1) = “strongly disagree”, to 7) “strongly agree” with a possible range of 30 to 210. The items were summed in order to create an overall score. Some questions were reverse-scored; higher scores reflect higher authoritarian attitudes ( $M = 123.88$ ;  $SD = 20.91$ ; Range= 66-170). Reliability in the present study was acceptable ( $\alpha = .82$ ). See appendix B.

*Hostility Toward Women* (HTW; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). The scale used in the present study to assess hostility toward women is a shorter version of Check, Malamuth, Elias, and Barton’s (1985) original 30-item HTW scale. The shorter version

contains 9 items. A sample item is “I think that most women would lie just to get ahead.” Items were answered using a dichotomous scale: true or false. Each item answered “true” was scored 2; each item answered “false” was scored 1. Items 2 and 3 were reverse-scored. Items answered “true” reflected hostility toward women. The possible range for this scale was 9 to 18. In the present sample, the mean was 11.73 (SD = 2.15; Range = 9-17). Higher scores reflect greater hostility toward women.

Cronbach’s alpha in the present study was .71. See Appendix C.

*Attitudes Toward Violence* (ATV; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). The present study utilized a shortened version of the ATV scale. The revised scale was derived from the original 47-item scale developed by Velicer et al. (1989). The revised ATV is a 20-item scale that assesses beliefs about violence (e.g., “Punishing children physically when they deserve it will make them responsible and mature adults.”). The items were scored using a dichotomous scale; response choices were either “true,” or “false.” Items were scored as follows: true = 2, false = 1. Items were summed to yield an overall ATV score; higher scores indicated more positive attitudes toward violence (M = 26.27; SD = 3.15; Range = 21-35). The reliability of the revised scale is good ( $\alpha = .87$ ; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995); reliability for the present study was .87. See Appendix D.

*Rape Myth Acceptance* (RMA; Burt, 1980). The RMA is a 19-item questionnaire that was used to measure an individual’s acceptance of rape myths. The statements reflect common myths regarding rape. A sample item is: “Many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and ‘changed their minds’ afterwards.” The items were scored using a 7-point Likert scale from: 1) “Strongly Disagree”, to 7) “Strongly Agree.” This scoring system is reversed from the original in an effort to simplify the presentation



of the findings (higher scores reflect greater acceptance of rape myths). Items were summed to reflect an overall RMA score ( $M = 40.30$ ;  $SD = 17.62$ ; Range = 19-98). The RMA demonstrated excellent reliability ( $\alpha = .91$ ). See Appendix E.

*Sexual Experiences Questionnaire* (SEQ; Lisak & Roth, 1988). The SEQ is a 29-item questionnaire that was derived from the Sexual Experiences Survey developed by Koss and Oros (1982). The revised SEQ (Lisak & Roth, 1988) has two parts. For the purposes of the present study, only the items from the second part of the questionnaire were examined. The second section of the SEQ measured the constructs of Manipulative Sexual Behavior, Coercive Sexual Behavior, Sexual Assault, Attempted Rape, Rape, and Fantasy Rape. Respondents answered each item of this section of the SEQ using a continuous scale: 1) "Never," to 7) "Often." Items can be summed in order to reflect a total sexual experiences score or each of the forms of sexual aggression can be examined separately (Lalumiere et al., 1996; Lisak, 1994; Lisak & Ivan, 1995; Lisak & Miller, 2002; Lisak & Roth, 1990; Maxwell, Robinson, & Post, 2003; Ouimette, 1997). For the purposes of the present study, each type of sexual aggression measured by the second section of the SEQ was examined. Participants who responded to any of the questions that comprise each of the six subscales assessed by the second part of the SEQ with a response other than "1" (Never) were assigned a "2" for that subscale. This method of identifying sexual aggression for each of the six categories of sexual aggression is similar to that employed in previous research utilizing the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Lalumiere et al., 1996; Lisak, 1994; Lisak & Ivan, 1995; Lisak & Miller, 2002; Lisak & Roth, 1990; Maxwell, 2003; Ouimette, 1997). See Appendix F.

Questions 20-23 of the SEQ assess Manipulative Sexual Behavior. The questions that measure this construct are as follows: “Have you ever had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because you threatened to end your relationship with her otherwise;” “Have you ever had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because she felt pressured by your continual arguments;” “Have you ever obtained sexual intercourse with a woman by making her think that you cared for her more than you really did;” “Have you ever obtained sexual intercourse with a woman by deliberately getting her too drunk to resist?” As noted above, similar to previous research with the SEQ, participants who endorsed anything other than “never” to any of the items that assessed this form of sexual aggression were categorized as having exhibited manipulative sexual behavior and assigned a score of “2” for this measure of sexual aggression. Respondents who answered “never” to each of the questions that assessed Manipulative Sexual Behavior were assigned a “1” for this form of sexual aggression.

Question 24 of the SEQ measured Coercive Sexual Behavior (e.g., “Have you ever persisted in having sexual intercourse with a woman, without using force, even though she verbally tried to stop you?”). Participants answered each question from: 1 = Never, to 7 = Often. For participants who answered with a response other than “Never,” the SEQ asks respondents to answer three questions that assess the degree to which they felt “anger,” “need to assert yourself,” and “sexual frustration” on a 7-point Likert scale from: 1 = Never, to 7 = Often; however, for the purposes of this study, responses to the follow-up questions were not examined. Participants who responded with an answer other than “never” were classified as having engaged in coercive sexual behavior and

assigned a score of “2”. Participants who responded “never” to this item were given a score of “1”.

Question 25 measured Sexual Assault: “Have you ever been in a situation where you used or threatened to use physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down) to make a woman engage in kissing or petting when she didn't want to?” on a scale from: 1 = Never to 7 = Often. Participants with responses other than “never” for this item were considered to have exhibited behavior consistent with the definition of sexual assault and were given a score of “2” for this form of sexual aggression. Participants who answered “never” to this question were assigned a score of “1” for this category of sexual aggression.

Question 26 assessed Attempted Rape (i.e., “Have you ever been in a situation where you tried, but for various reasons did not succeed, in having sexual intercourse with a woman by using or threatening to use physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) if she didn't cooperate?” on a scale from: 1 = Never to 7 = Often. If the respondent answered “yes,” then he was asked to rate feelings of “anger,” “need to assert yourself,” and “sexual frustration.” For the purposes of the present study, only the initial item that assessed attempted rape was examined to assign participants a categorization for this form of sexual aggression. Specifically, men who answered “never” were assigned a score of “1”; those who endorsed a response other than “never” were given a score of “2” for the category of attempted rape.

The next two questions assessed behaviors that constitute Rape. Specifically, question 27 evaluates intercourse rape (e.g., “Have you ever had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because you used or threatened to use physical force

[twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.] if she didn't cooperate?) on a scale from: 1 = Never to 7 = Often. Statement 28 evaluates oral rape (e.g., "Have you ever had oral sex with a woman when she didn't want to because you used or threatened to use physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc. if she didn't cooperate?)" on a scale from: 1 = Never to 7 = Often. If the respondent endorsed anything other than "never" to either question, for both items he was asked to rate his feelings of "anger," "need to assert yourself," and "sexual frustration" and was included in the category of rape. For the purposes of the present research the follow-up questions that assessed feelings about these behaviors were not examined. Men who endorsed any response other than "never" to the two questions that assessed rape were assigned a score of "2."

The last SEQ question evaluated Fantasy Rape and was assessed with question 29: "Have you ever felt the urge to physically force a woman to have sexual intercourse with you even though you did not act on the urge?" The scores were on a scale from: 1 = Never to 7 = Often. If the participant endorsed a response from 2 to 7, they were assigned a score for the Fantasy Rape subscale score of "2"; participants who answered, "never" were assigned a score of "1" for the category of Fantasy Rape. Reliability of the Koss et al. (1987) version of the SEQ is good ( $\alpha = .93$ ). Reliability of the SEQ in the present study was also good ( $\alpha = .91$ ).

### *Procedure*

*Consent procedure.* The participants were notified of the research study and given the opportunity to volunteer their time by means of a handout/bulletin board posting (see Appendix H) and/or announcement by the researcher. Due to the sensitive nature of the questions, individuals who participated were given clear instructions

regarding the nature of the survey. In addition, prior to completing the survey, potential participants received a participation notification form that described the nature of the survey. Both the verbal instructions and participation notification form explicitly asked individuals who were interested in participating not to provide any identifying information on the survey itself. In addition, the verbal and written instructions acknowledge that respondents were free not to participate in the study or free to skip questions.

Participants who were members of the psychology subject pool (in which students participated in order to receive research credit for an undergraduate psychology course) took a survey packet home, completed the packet, and returned the packet to a designated office. These participants were also instructed to read and check the participation notification form indicating that they were aware of the type of information to be collected and that the survey was anonymous. In order to maintain confidentiality, participants were not met with individually. Individual packets were distributed by the research assistant and anonymously returned in unsigned, unmarked envelopes to the research assistant's office.

*Survey procedure.* For participants who completed the survey during a regularly scheduled campus organization meeting, after the study was thoroughly explained, they were given the opportunity to ask questions. At this time, they were given the participant notification form along with the survey packets. As noted above, they indicated that they understood the nature of the study by checking a box on the form before they completed the survey. The survey packet included a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix G) and the five scales: Altemeyer's (1981) Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale, Lonsway

and Fitzgerald's (1995) Hostility Toward Women scale, Lonsway and Fitzgerald's (1995) Attitudes Toward Violence scale, Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance scale, and Lisak and Roth's Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. The scales were presented in counterbalanced order; the demographics questionnaire appeared last. The participants were instructed not to go back and change their answers once they had completed the questionnaires.

## RESULTS

### *Preliminary Analyses*

Means, standard deviations, and the range for the predictor variables are reported in Table 2. Each of the predictor variables was examined for normality. In each case, analyses revealed no evidence of skewness or kurtosis ( $p > .05$ ). A series of correlations were performed in order to assess whether the continuous predictor variables were related. Results of these analyses are presented in Table 3.

### *Categorization of Sexual Aggression*

A moderate number of participants reported having engaged in at least one of the six subscales of sexually aggressive behavior. The frequencies of each sexual aggression subscale are as follows: 55% of the participants reported having engaged in manipulative sexual behavior; 24% of the participants reported that they had engaged in coercive sexual behavior; 9% of the participants reported that they had engaged in sexual assault, 9% of the participants reported that they had attempted rape, 9% reported that they had engaged in rape; furthermore, 22% of the respondents reported that they had fantasized about rape. The results of the frequency distribution are displayed in Table 4.

Inspection of the data revealed that 44 of the 67 participants had engaged in at least one of the categories of sexual aggression: 37 had engaged in manipulative sexual behavior, 16 had engaged in coercive sexual behavior, six had sexually assaulted a woman, six had attempted rape, six reported they had engaged in rape, and 15 had fantasized about rape. Of these, 20 of the 44 participants had engaged in at least two of the categories of sexually aggressive behavior. Only two of the 44 participants reported

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Predictor Variables*

Variable	AUTH	HTW	ATV	RMA
Mean	123.88	11.73	26.27	40.30
SD	20.91	2.15	3.15	17.62

Variable	AUTH	HTW	ATV	RMA
Range	105 (66-170)	9 (9-17)	15 (21-35)	80 (19-98)

*Note.* AUTH= Total Authoritarianism; HTW= Total Hostility Toward Women; ATV= Total Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA= Total Rape Myth Acceptance.

Table 3

*Correlations Among Predictor Variables*

Variable	AUTH	HTW	ATV	RMA
AUTH	--			
HTW	.05	--		
ATV	.02	.44***	--	
RMA	.18	.24	.35**	--

*Note.* \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ ; AUTH= Total Authoritarianism; HTW= Total Hostility Toward Women; ATV= Total Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA= Total Rape Myth Acceptance.



Table 4

*Frequencies of Participants Categorized as Having Engaged in Each Form of Sexually Aggressive Behavior Based on Responses to the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ)*

SEQ Subscale	No	Yes
Manipulative Sexual Behavior	30/67 (44.8%)	37/67 (55.2%)
Coercive Sexual Behavior	51/67 (76.1%)	16/67 (23.9%)
Sexual Assault	61/67 (91%)	6/67 (9%)
Attempted Rape	61/67 (91%)	6/67 (9%)
Rape	61/67 (91%)	6/67 (9%)
Fantasy Rape	52/67 (77.6%)	15/67 (22.4%)

*Note.*  $N = 67$ ; Percentages include how many participants reported that they had engaged in each form of sexual aggression as determined by categorization scores on the SEQ. Categorizations were determined as followed: No = Responses of 'never' to each SEQ item that assessed that subscale of sexual aggression; Yes = Responses other than 'never' for any item that assessed each SEQ item for that comprised that subscale of sexual aggression.

having engaged in all six different categories of sexual aggression. With respect to the more severe forms of sexual aggression (i.e., sexual assault, attempted rape, rape), nine participants had engaged in one or more of the following: sexual assault, attempted rape, and rape. Of these nine participants, four participants reported that they had engaged in all three severe forms of sexual aggression (i.e., sexual assault, attempted rape, rape).

### *Hypothesis Testing*

Each hypothesis was tested using a standard logistic regression to test whether the independent variables significantly predicted the subscale scores from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. Specifically, the predictor variables were as follows: Authoritarianism (continuous), Hostility Toward Women (continuous), Attitudes Toward Violence (continuous), and Rape Myth Acceptance (continuous). The dependent variables reflected categorization scores for the six subscales from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. Prior to conducting the logistic regressions, each respondent received six scores; one score for each form of sexual aggression assessed by the SEQ. The six scores reflected whether the individual reported that they had ever engaged in any form of the following six forms of sexual aggression (i.e., manipulative sexual behavior, coercive sexual behavior, sexual assault, attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape. More specifically, if a respondent answered anything other than “1” (never) for any of the behaviors that comprised a particular subscale of the SEQ, for that form of sexual aggression on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, he was considered to have engaged in sexually aggressive behavior at least once; therefore, he was given a score of “2” for that form of sexual aggression; respondents who answered ‘never’ to all questions that comprised a subscale of sexual aggression received a score of “1” for that form of sexual aggression. This procedure was followed for each type of sexual aggression such that six non-continuous scores were created for each form of sexual aggression.

*Hypothesis 1.* For Hypothesis 1, a standard logistic regression was conducted in order to test whether authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance predicted subscale scores based on the SEQ responses for manipulative sexual behavior. The chi-square goodness of fit test demonstrated that the combination of independent variables did not significantly predict subscale scores for Manipulative Sexual Behavior:  $X^2(4) = 5.80, p = .21, R^2 = .08$ . The individual predictor details are as follows. Authoritarianism was not a significant predictor of manipulative sexual behavior, AUTH:  $X^2(1) = .02, p = .88$ , odds ratio = 1.00 (.97-1.02). Hostility Toward Women also did not significantly contribute to the prediction of manipulative sexual behavior, HTW:  $X^2(1) = 1.95, p = .16$ , odds ratio = 1.22 (.92-1.56). Attitudes Toward Violence is not a significant predictor of manipulative sexual behavior, ATV:  $X^2(1) = 0.97, p = .33$ , odds ratio = 1.10 (.91-1.34). Rape Myth Acceptance is not a significant predictor of manipulative sexual behavior, RMA:  $X^2(1) = .07, p = .79$ , odds ratio = 1.00 (.97-1.04). Rape Myth Acceptance did not significantly predict manipulative sexual behavior, RMA:  $X^2(1) = .07, p = .79$ , odds ratio = 1.00 (.97-1.04). Results from the logistic regression for Hypothesis 1 are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

*Standard Logistic Regression for Manipulative Sexual Behavior*

Variable	B	SE	Wald statistic ( $X^2$ )	Odds Ratio <sup>1</sup>
AUTH	-.00	.01	.02	1.00 (.97-1.02)

Table 5 continued.

Variable	B	SE	Wald statistic ( $X^2$ )	Odds Ratio <sup>1</sup>
HTW	.20	.14	1.95	1.22 (.92-1.56)
ATV	.10	.10	.97	1.10 (.91-1.34)
RMA	.00	.02	.07	1.00 (.97-1.04)

<sup>1</sup>Confidence Intervals are in Parentheses.

Note. AUTH = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; ATV = Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance.

*Hypothesis 2.* For the next hypothesis, a second standard logistic regression was conducted in order to test whether authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance predicted subscale scores based on the SEQ responses for coercive sexual behavior. The chi-square goodness of fit test demonstrated that the combination of independent variables did not significantly predict subscale scores for Coercive Sexual Behavior:  $X^2(4) = 7.81, p = .099, R^2 = .11$ . The individual predictor details are as follows. Authoritarianism is not a significant predictor of coercive sexual behavior, AUTH:  $X^2(1) = .38, p = .96$ , odds ratio = .99 (.96-1.02). Hostility Toward Women is not a significant predictor of coercive sexual behavior, HTW:  $X^2(1) = .60, p = .44$ , odds ratio = 1.13 (.83-1.53). Attitudes Toward Violence is not a significant predictor of coercive sexual behavior, ATV:  $X^2(1) = .00, p = .96$ , odds ratio = .99 (.80-1.24). Although the results of the overall chi-square analysis were not significant, Rape Myth Acceptance did significantly predict coercive sexual behavior, RMA:  $X^2(1) = 4.90, p = .03$ , odds ratio = 1.04 (1.01-1.08). Participants were 1.04 times

more likely to have engaged in coercive sexual behavior with every one-unit increase in rape myth acceptance. Specifically, participants were 4% more likely to have engaged in coercive sexual behavior with every one-unit increase in rape myth acceptance. The results for this logistic regression are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

*Standard Logistic Regression for Coercive Sexual Behavior*

Variable	B	SE	Wald statistic ( $X^2$ )	Odds Ratio <sup>1</sup>
AUTH	-.01	.02	.38	.99 (.96-1.02)
HTW	.12	.16	.60	1.13 (.83-1.53)
ATV	-.01	.11	.00	.99 (.80-1.24)
RMA	.04	.02	4.90*	1.04 (1.01-1.08)

<sup>1</sup>Confidence Intervals are in Parentheses.

\* $p < .05$ .

Note. AUTH = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; ATV = Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance.

*Hypothesis 3.* A third standard logistic regression was conducted in order to test whether authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance predicted subscale scores based on SEQ responses for sexual assault. The chi-square goodness of fit test demonstrated that the combination of independent variables did not significantly predict categorization scores for Sexual Assault:  $X^2(4) = 6.45, p = .17, R^2 = .09$ . The individual predictor details are as follows. Authoritarianism was not a significant predictor of sexual assault, AUTH:  $X^2(1) = .01, p = .91$ , odds ratio

= 1.00 (.95-1.06). Hostility Toward Women was not a significant predictor of sexual assault, HTW:  $X^2(1) = .99, p = .32$ , odds ratio = 1.25 (.81-1.93). Attitudes Toward Violence did not significantly predict sexual assault, ATV:  $X^2(1) = 1.33, p = .25$ , odds ratio = .78 (.52-1.19). Although the overall chi-square analyses for this form of sexual aggression was not significant, results of the logistic regression revealed that Rape Myth Acceptance was a significant predictor of sexual assault, RMA:  $X^2(1) = 4.29, p = .04$ , odds ratio = 1.06 (1.00-1.13). Participants were 1.06 times more likely to have reported engaging in sexual assault with every one-unit increase in rape myth acceptance. Participants were 6% more likely to have sexually assaulted with every one-unit increase (e.g., 20 to 21) in rape myth acceptance scores. The results are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7

*Standard Logistic Regression for Sexual Assault*

Variable	B	SE	Wald statistic ( $X^2$ )	Odds Ratio <sup>1</sup>
AUTH	-.00	.03	.01	1.00 (.95-1.06)
HTW	.22	.22	.99	1.25 (.81-1.93)
ATV	-.25	.21	1.33	.78 (.52-1.19)
RMA	.06	.03	4.29*	1.06 (1.00-1.13)

<sup>1</sup>Confidence Intervals are in Parentheses.

\* $p < .05$ .

Note. AUTH = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; ATV = Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance.

*Hypothesis 4.* To test whether authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance predicted attempted rape, a logistic regression was conducted. The chi-square goodness of fit test demonstrated that the combination of independent variables significantly predicted whether participants were categorized as meeting the criteria for Attempted Rape based on their responses to the SEQ:  $X^2(4) = 17.11, p = .002, R^2 = .23$ . The correct classification percentage is as follows: 98.4% of the respondents were correctly identified as not having attempted rape (60 out of 61) based on their SEQ responses; 50% of the participants were correctly identified as having attempted rape (3 out of 6) based on their SEQ responses. Overall, 94% were correctly identified as having attempted rape or not having attempted rape. The individual predictor details are as follows. Authoritarianism was not a significant predictor of attempted rape, AUTH:  $X^2(1) = .002, p = .42$ , odds ratio = 1.00 (.94-1.06). Hostility Toward Women was not a significant predictor of attempted rape, HTW:  $X^2(1) = 2.67, p = .13$ , odds ratio = 1.57 (.92-2.68). Attitudes Toward Violence was not a significant predictor of attempted rape, ATV:  $X^2(1) = .56, p = .20$ , odds ratio = .83 (.52-1.34). Rape Myth Acceptance, however, was a significant predictor of attempted rape, RMA:  $X^2(1) = 6.40, p = .02$ , odds ratio = 1.12 (1.03-1.22). Participants were 1.12 times (12%) more likely to have attempted rape with every one-unit increase in rape myth acceptance. In other words, participants who endorsed rape myth acceptance were 1.12 times (12%) more likely to attempt rape than those who did not endorse rape myth acceptance. The results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

*Standard Logistic Regression for Attempted Rape*

Variable	B	SE	Wald statistic ( $X^2$ )	Odds Ratio <sup>1</sup>
AUTH	-.00	.03	.00	1.00 (.94-1.06)
HTW	.45	.27	2.67	1.57 (.92-2.68)
ATV	-.18	.24	.56	.83 (.52-1.34)
RMA	.11	.05	6.40*	1.12 (1.03-1.22)

<sup>1</sup>Confidence Intervals are in Parentheses.

\* $p < .05$ .

Note. AUTH = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; ATV = Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance.

*Hypothesis 5.* For Hypothesis 5, a standard logistic regression was conducted in order to test whether authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance predicted categorization scores from the SEQ for Rape. As shown in Table 4, 61 were identified as not having engaged in rape; 6 were identified as having engaged in rape. The chi-square goodness of fit test demonstrated that the combination of independent variables significantly predicted the subscale of Rape:  $X^2(4) = 10.42, p = .034, R^2 = .14$ . The correct classification percentage is as follows: 98.4% of the participants were correctly identified as not having engaged in rape (60 out of 61); 16.7% of respondents (1 out of 6) were correctly identified as having engaged in rape. Overall, 91% were correctly identified. Authoritarianism was not a significant predictor of rape, AUTH:  $X^2(1) = .64, p = .42$ , odds ratio = .98 (.93-1.03). Hostility Toward Women did not significantly predict rape, HTW:  $X^2(1) = 2.24, p = .13$ , odds ratio = 1.42



(.90-2.23). Attitudes Toward Violence was not a significant predictor of rape, ATV:  $X^2(1) = 1.64, p = .20$ , odds ratio = .74 (.46-1.18). RMA:  $X^2(1) = 5.32, p = .02$ , odds ratio = 1.08 (1.01-1.16). Rape Myth Acceptance was a significant predictor of rape, RMA:  $X^2(1) = 5.32, p = .02$ , odds ratio = 1.08 (1.01-1.16). Participants were 1.08 times (8%) more likely to have engaged in rape with every one-unit increase in rape myth acceptance. Specifically, participants who endorsed rape myth acceptance were 1.08 times (8%) more likely to rape than those who did not endorse rape myth acceptance. The results for the logistic regression predicting Rape categorization scores are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

*Standard Logistic Regression for Rape*

Variable	B	SE	Wald statistic ( $X^2$ )	Odds Ratio <sup>1</sup>
AUTH	-.02	.03	.64	.98 (.93-1.03)
HTW	.35	.23	2.24	1.42 (.90-2.23)
ATV	-.31	.24	1.64	.74 (.46-1.18)
RMA	.08	.03	5.32*	1.08 (1.01-1.16)

<sup>1</sup>Confidence Intervals are in Parentheses.

\* $p < .05$ .

Note. AUTH = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; ATV = Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance.

*Hypothesis 6.* The final logistic regression was conducted to test whether authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance predicted scores for fantasy rape based on responses to items that assessed

this form of sexual aggression from the SEQ. As shown in Table 4, 52 were categorized as not having fantasized about rape; 15 were identified as having fantasized about rape. The chi-square goodness of fit test demonstrated that the combination of independent variables significantly predicted categorization scores for Fantasy Rape based on participants' responses to the SEQ items that assessed this behavior:  $\chi^2 (4) = 22.79, p = .000, R^2 = .29$ . The correct classification percentage is as follows: 90.4% of the respondents that were correctly categorized as not having fantasized about rape (47 out of 52); and 46.7% of the participants (7 out of 15) were correctly identified as having fantasized about rape. Overall, 80.6% were correctly classified. The results are displayed in Table 10. The results of the individual predictors are as follows:

Authoritarianism did not predict fantasy rape, AUTH:  $\chi^2 (1) = .77, p = .38$ , odds ratio = 1.02 (.98-1.05). Hostility Toward Women was not a significant predictor of fantasy rape, HTW:  $\chi^2 (1) = .14, p = .71$ , odds ratio = .93 (.62-1.39). Attitudes Toward Violence did not significantly predict fantasy rape, ATV:  $\chi^2 (1) = .01, p = .91$ , odds ratio = 1.02 (.77-1.35). Rape Myth Acceptance significantly predicted fantasy rape, RMA:  $\chi^2 (1) = 12.34, p = .00$ , odds ratio = 1.10 (1.04-1.16). Participants were 1.10 times more likely to have engaged in fantasy rape with every one-unit increase in rape myth acceptance. Specifically, participants who endorsed rape myth acceptance were 1.10 times (10%) more likely to fantasize about rape than those who did not endorse rape myth acceptance. The results are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

*Standard Logistic Regression for Fantasy Rape*

Variable	B	SE	Wald statistic ( $X^2$ )	Odds Ratio <sup>1</sup>
AUTH	-.02	.02	.77	1.02 (.98-1.05)
HTW	-.08	.21	.14	.93 (.62-1.39)
ATV	.02	.15	.01	1.02 (.77-1.35)
RMA	.09	.03	12.34***	1.10 (1.04-1.16)

<sup>1</sup>Confidence Intervals are in Parentheses

\*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Note. AUTH = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; ATV = Attitudes Toward Violence; RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present research study was to observe whether authoritarianism, hostility toward women, attitudes toward violence, and rape myth acceptance predicted various subscales of sexual aggression (manipulative sexual behavior, coercive sexual behavior, sexual assault, attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape). The present study expands on previous literature by examining whether each of the predictor variables account for participant's reports of different types of sexual aggression.

Prior to hypothesis testing, correlations were conducted to identify relationships between the predictor variables. Similar to previous research (e.g., Caron & Carter, 1997) participants who endorsed higher attitudes toward violence reported higher rape myth acceptance. Although the correlation between hostility toward women and rape myth acceptance was in the expected direction (.24), the relationship between these two variables was not statistically significant. This finding is in contrast to those reported by Zielinski (1996) who found a significant positive relationship between hostility toward women and reported rape myth acceptance.

In the present study, men were categorized as having exhibited each of the forms of sexual aggression based on whether they had ever engaged in each of the types of sexual aggression. Based on this method of categorizing respondents, it was concluded that more than half of respondents had engaged in manipulative sexual behavior at some point (55.2%). These results suggest that the majority of college student men have engaged in manipulation to obtain sex. Compared to previous research, the percentage of

men who have engaged in sexual aggression is high and closer to the actual amount of sexual perpetration typically reported by female college students (Koss et al., 1987).

In the present study 9% of respondents admitted to having engaged in behavior that constitutes rape. This percentage is slightly higher than a previous study in which only 7.7% of respondents engaged in behaviors meeting the legal definition of rape (Koss et al., 1987). Previous research has identified each of these variables as significant predictors of sexual aggression (e.g., Lackie & de Man, 1997; Malamuth et al., 1995; McCollaum & Lester, 1997; Walker et al., 1993). In contrast, the present study found only rape myth acceptance significantly and positively predicted five of the six forms of sexual aggression examined. Specifically, participants' who reported attitudes that placed greater responsibility for rape on women, were more likely to report having engaged in rape, attempted rape, and fantasy rape. Although the analyses examining coercive sexual aggression and sexual assault were not statistically significant, it is important to recognize that rape myth acceptance was associated with both coercive sexual aggression and sexual assault. Results from previous research support the view that rape myth acceptance is associated with sexually aggressive behavior (Bohner et al., 1998; Malamuth et al., 1995; Zielinski, 1996). In fact, the only form of sexual aggression not significantly associated with rape myth acceptance was manipulative sexual behavior. Manipulative sexual behavior was the most common form of sexual aggression examined. As noted above, 55% of respondents indicated that they had engaged in this behavior to obtain sex. Therefore, it appears that behaviors such as manipulative behavior that rely on non-violence forms of sexual aggression may not be associated with

rape myth acceptance. Clearly, additional research is needed to understand beliefs that are associated with manipulating a partner to obtain sex.

In contrast to rape myth acceptance, which was positively associated with various forms of sexual aggression, authoritarianism, attitudes toward violence, and hostility toward women did not contribute to any of the forms of sexual aggression examined. More specifically, authoritarianism did not significantly predict any of the forms of sexual aggression assessed. Results from the present study are inconsistent with previous literature that found authoritarianism predicted sexual aggression (Begany & Milburn, 2002; Malamuth, 1986; Walker et al., 1993). In part, the lack of significant findings may reflect a relatively low mean for right-wing authoritarianism responses ( $M = 1.84$ ;  $SD = 0.70$ ). Kilianski (2003) reported the mean score for right-wing authoritarian responses was  $M = 3.14$  ( $SD = 0.83$ ).

In addition, hostility toward women did not significantly predict any of the forms of sexual aggression examined in the present study. Again, this finding is in contrast with previous research that has identified hostility toward women as significantly related to men's sexually aggressive behavior (e.g., Lackie & de Man, 1997; Malamuth, 1988; McCollaum & Lester, 1997; Smith & Stewart, 2003).

Furthermore, attitude toward violence was not a significant predictor of any subscale of sexual aggression. Again, this is in contrast to previous literature (Bookwala, Frieze, & Smith, 1992; Caron & Carter, 1997; Lackie & de Man, 1997). This could be due to a necessity of other factors in conjunction with attitudes toward violence in order to predict sexually aggressive behavior more accurately. Intuitively, endorsing violent attitudes alone may not make someone more likely to engage in sexually aggressive

behavior, per se. Moreover, manipulative sexual behavior was the only form of sexual aggression that did not rely on physical violence. More research is warranted to identify the combination of factors that may significantly contribute to sexually aggressive behavior.

The present study suggests the importance of programs that attempt to target men's beliefs about rape. Because rape myth acceptance was predictive of sexual assault, rape, and attempted rape, it is possible that testing for one's views of rape myth acceptance may help the individual better understand their propensity to engage in sexual assault, rape and attempt rape. Future research is warranted in an effort to understand this particular predictor variable and its role in specific types and subscales of sexual aggression in an effort to understand what factors specifically contribute to more severe forms of sexual aggression.

#### *Study Strengths*

The present study has several important methodological strengths. In contrast to the majority of previous research, the present study examined specific aspects of sexual aggression. In addition, the present study classified participants according to whether they had ever engaged in the various forms of sexual aggression. Internal reliability of each of the scales and subscales was good. Furthermore, the logistic regression is a relatively flexible analysis in that there are few restrictions. Finally, the population was fairly diverse in demographics, providing results from a wide variety of people.

In order to establish moderate power in the present study, it was important to have an adequate sample size to reduce the Type II error rate. According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), a good rule of thumb is to make sure the study has at least 10

participants per predictor variable. The present research examined five predictor variables, thus requiring at least 50 participants in order to achieve decent power. This was accomplished, as there were 67 participants in the present study.

Another strength of the present study is in the measurement of the dependent variables. As previously mentioned, most other studies that utilized the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire measured responses on a continuous scale (i.e. 1 for “Never” and 7 for “Often”). The present study grouped participants as having ever (or never) engaged in an act of sexual aggression. In contrast to results by previous studies that may have been skewed by a few men who engage in sexually aggressive behavior repeatedly.

#### *Study Limitations*

A number of limitations should be noted. Convenience sampling was employed in the present research study; therefore, the results of this sample may not be generalizable to men who do not attend college. Although more than half of the participants reported that they had engaged in some form of sexually aggressive behavior, only nine participants reported that they had engaged in either sexual assault, rape, or attempted rape. The low frequency with which serious forms of sexual aggression is common. It is possible that Type I error may have increased due to the likelihood that participants who engaged in one kind of sexually aggressive behavior have also engaged in another kind of sexually aggressive behavior (essentially, analyzing the same participants more than once); however, only two of the nine participants who had engaged in the more severe forms of sexual aggression had engaged in all six forms of sexual aggression.



While respondents were assured that their responses were confidential and no identifying information was collected, it is possible that some men were reluctant to report physically aggressive forms of sexual aggression and, in some instances, behaviors that are illegal. In addition, the present study assumes that men are unbiased in their assessment of sexually aggressive behavior and assumes that men recall all episodes of the types of behaviors examined. In addition, some forms of sexual aggression were examined with a single item.

Furthermore, participants were categorized as having engaged in the various forms of sexual aggression based on whether they reported that they had *ever* engaged in the various forms of sexual aggression. Men who have ever engaged in these forms of behavior may differ from men who repeatedly engage in these forms of behavior. In general, previous research has examined sexual aggression as a continuous measure. Examining sexual aggression as a continuous measure may bias previous study findings in terms of outliers (i.e., men who engage in these behaviors frequently). Due to the correlational nature of this study, causality cannot be established. It is possible that engaging in sexual aggression influences beliefs about rape myth acceptance.

#### *Future Research*

Further research is warranted regarding testing various subscales of sexual aggression separately. It is important to identify specific predictive factors of specific types of sexually aggressive behavior in order to more completely understand the complexities of these relationships. Furthermore, future research should focus on not only severe forms of sexual aggression but also less severe forms (i.e. manipulative sexual behavior) in an effort to better understand behaviors that may lead to more serious

forms of sexual aggression and potentially lead up to more serious sexual aggression.

Finally, further research is needed in various other populations. Also, research should examine children and young adolescents to understand the antecedents of serious forms of sexual aggression. It is especially important to address where these attitudes and behaviors possibly originate.

## CONCLUSION

The present study has demonstrated that sexual aggression is common among many college age men. In the present study, several men had engaged in the various forms of sexual aggression. Of 67 total men, 55% (37) had engaged in manipulative sexual behavior, 24% (16), had engaged in coercive sexual behavior, 9% (6) had engaged in sexual assaults 9% (6) reported that they had engaged in attempted rape, 9% (6) reported that they had engaged in rape, and 23% (15) reported that they had fantasized about rape. In contrast to previous research, rape myth acceptance was the only significant predictor of any form of sexual aggression in this study. Specifically, rape myth acceptance significantly and positively predicted coercive sexual behavior, sexual assault, attempted rape, rape, and fantasy rape.

## REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perception of sexual assault. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 72*, 747-756.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. Oxford, England: Harpers.
- Altemeyer, R. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, R. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- American Psychological Association. "Code of Ethics," 2002, <<http://www.apa.org/ethics/code2002.html#standards>> (8 December 2003).
- Ayers, J. B., Rohr, M. E., & Rohr, E. M. (1978). College major, authoritarianism, and attitudes toward women. *College Student Journal, 12*, 236-239.
- Badgett, J. L., Fair, S., & Hunkler, R. F. (1974). The authoritarianism exhibited by intelligent men and women. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 15*, 509-512.
- Begany, J. J., & Milburn, M. A. (2002). Psychological predictors of sexual harassment: Authoritarianism, hostile sexism, and rape myths. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*, 119-126.
- Bohner, G., Reinhard, M. A., Rutz, S., Sturm, S., Kerschbaum, B., & Effler, D. (1998). Rape myths as neutralizing cognitions: Evidence for a causal impact of anti-victim attitudes on men's self-reported likelihood of raping. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 257-268.

- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., & Smith, C. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 297-311.
- Breitenbecher, K. H. (2000). Sexual assault on college campuses: Is an ounce of prevention enough? *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 9, 23-52.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.
- Campbell, R. (1995). The role of work experience and individual beliefs in police officers' perceptions of date rape: An integration of quantitative and qualitative methods. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 249-277.
- Caron, S. L., & Carter, D. B. (1997). The relationships among sex role orientation, egalitarianism, attitudes toward sexuality, and attitudes toward violence against women. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 568-587.
- Check, J. V. P., Malamuth, N. M., Elias, B., & Barton, S. (1985). On hostile ground. *Psychology Today*, 56-61.
- Christopher, F. S., Owens, L. A., & Stecker, H. L. (1993). An examination of single men's and women's sexual aggressiveness in dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10, 511-527.
- Dean, K. E., & Malamuth, N. M. (1997). Characteristics of men who aggress sexually and of men who imagine aggressing: Risk and moderating variables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 449-455.
- Epstein, R. (1965). Authoritarianism, displaced aggression, and social status of the target. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 2, 585-589.

- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). First- and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women: Their interrelationships and association with college students' experiences with dating aggression and sexual coercion. *Violence Against Women, 10*, 236-261.
- Hall, G. C. N., Hirshman, R., Graham, J. R., & Zaragoza, M. (1993). Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment, and treatment. Series in applied psychology: Social issues and questions. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Hull, D. B., & Burke, J. (1991). The religious right, attitudes toward women, and tolerance for sexual abuse. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 17*, 1-12.
- Kilianski, S. E. (2003). Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes toward women and gay men: The theory of exclusively masculine identity. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*, 37-56.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz C. D., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.
- Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*, 455-457.
- Lackie, L., & deMan, A. F. (1997). Correlates of sexual aggression among male university students. *Sex Roles, 37*, 451-457.
- Lalumiere, M. L., Chalmers, L. J., & Quinsey, V. L. (1996). A test of the mate deprivation hypothesis of sexual coercion. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 17*, 299-318.

- Lisak, D. (1994). Subjective assessment of relationships with parents by sexually aggressive and nonaggressive men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9*, 399-411.
- Lisak, D., & Ivan, C. (1995). Deficits in intimacy and empathy in sexually aggressive men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 296-308.
- Lisak, D., & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and Victims, 17*, 73-84.
- Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1988). Motivational factors in nonincarcerated sexually aggressive men. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 55*, 795-802.
- Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1990). Motives and psychodynamics of self-reported, unincarcerated rapists. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 60*, 268-280.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 704-711.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 953-962.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1988). A multidimensional approach to sexual aggression: Combining measures of past behavior and present likelihood. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 528*, 123-132.
- Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 353-369.

- Malamuth, N. M., Sockoloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 670-681.
- Maxwell, C. D., Robinson, A. L., & Post, L. A. (2003). The nature and predictors of sexual victimization and offending among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 32*, 465-477.
- McCollaun, B., & Lester, D. (1997). Sexual Aggression and attitudes toward women and mothers. *Journal of Social Psychology, 137*, 538-539.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). NY: Mc-Graw-Hill.
- Ouimette, P. (1997). Psychopathology and sexual aggression in nonincarcerated men. *Violence and Victims, 12*, 389-395.
- Peterson, S. A., & Franzese, F. B. (1987). Correlates of college men's sexual abuse of women. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*, 223-228.
- Smith, D., & Stewart, S. (2003). Sexual aggression and sports participation. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 26*, 384-395.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). Who likes competent women? Competence, congruence of interests, and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 2*, 197-213.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women. *National Institute of Justice*.



- Velicer, W. F., Huckel, L. H., & Hansen, C. E. (1989). A measurement model for measuring attitudes toward violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 349-364.
- Walker, W. D., Rowe, R. C., & Quinsey, V. L. (1993). Authoritarianism and sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1036-1045.
- Whitley, B. E. Jr. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 126-134.
- Zielinski, H. (1996). Fraternity men's attitudes toward women, acceptance of rape myths, and experiences of sexual aggression. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 8-B. (UMI No. 4647).

## APPENDIX A

## PARTICIPANT NOTIFICATION FORM

Old Dominion University

College of Sciences, Department of Psychology

Researcher: Gina Bondi (supervised by Dr. Michelle Kelley)

*Description of Research*

You are asked to participate as a volunteer in a scientific investigation as a part educational and research program of Old Dominion University conducted by Gina Bondi under the supervision of Dr. Michelle Kelley. The basic nature of this research involves your anonymous completion of five short questionnaires that assess personality characteristics and personal experiences. Some of the questionnaires or questions are sensitive. If you chose to participate, you are free to skip any questions you prefer not to answer.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and anonymous (your identity will not be known). If you choose to participate in this research, you will be asked to complete a participant notification form stating that you understand the nature of the research and giving your voluntary consent to participate in the study. The study will be described, any questions you may have will then be answered, and you will be asked to give your consent *prior* to receiving the questionnaires. The researchers will *not* have any way to link you identity to the information that you provide. In fact, please do *not* put your name or any other identifying information on the questionnaires so that your identity will not be known.

When you complete the questionnaires, please put the questionnaires in the envelope provided, seal the envelope, and return the envelope in the box next to the experimenter. Participation in this research project should take approximately 20-25 minutes.

#### *Requirements to Participate*

Male college students attending Old Dominion University are the target population for this research study. You must be at least 18 years old to participate.

#### *Risks and Benefits*

The completion of this study may result in increased self-awareness about your own personal attitudes and previous interpersonal experiences. For some people, this awareness may produce momentary discomfort; however, there will not be any adverse effects to your health or well being while participating. There may be unforeseen effects for particular persons. The main benefit for participating in this study is increased self-awareness of your own personal attitudes and behavior. You may also find the material in the questionnaire interesting and might learn something about yourself as a result of your participation.

#### *Costs and Payments*

Participation in this research is voluntary. Participation can contribute to possible improvements to the training academy and/or screening process.

#### *New Information*

Any new information obtained during the course of this research that is directly related to your willingness to continue to participate in this study will be provided to you upon request.

*Confidentiality*

Your responses will not be revealed to anyone other than the researchers. Please note that your name will not appear with the questionnaires; thus, your identity will not be linked to your responses. Your participation is completely anonymous.

*Withdrawal Privilege*

You may withhold any answer to any specific item(s) or question(s) in the questionnaire. You may also terminate your participation at any time without penalty.

*Compensation for Illness and Injury:*

Because this is a survey, it is unlikely that any physical illness or injury will result from this study. If any injury, physical or otherwise, should result, Old Dominion University does not provide insurance coverage, free medical care, or any other compensation for such injury; however, should your completion of the materials raise concerns about yourself for which you might seek free and confidential assistance at the University Counseling Center in Webb Center (683-4401). In the event that you believe you have suffered injury as a result of participation in any research project at the university, you may contact Chris Osgood, Chair of the College of Sciences Committee, at 683-3595.

*Agreement to Participate:*

By checking below, you indicate that you have been notified about your participation in this research project. A copy of this sheet will be provided to you for your personal records. If you have any concerns about your participation in this research, you may contact Gina Bondi at [gbond002@odu.edu](mailto:gbond002@odu.edu), Michelle Kelley at

mkelley@odu.edu, or Chris Osgood, Chair of the College of Sciences Committee, at 683-3595.

I agree to participate in this research study.

(Please check here) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please return one copy of this notification form with your completed survey;  
detach the other copy, and keep it for your own records.

## APPENDIX B

## RIGHT WING AUTHORITARIANISM (ALTEMEYER, 1988)

**Directions:** Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements using the following scale:

**STRONGLY****STRONGLY****DISAGREE****AGREE****1****2****3****4****5****6****7**

1. The way things are going in this country, it's going to take a lot of "strong medicine" to straighten out the troublemakers, criminals, and perverts.
2. It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like and to "do their own thing." \*
3. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.
4. People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral. \*
5. It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines and movies to keep trashy material away from the youth.
6. It may be considered old-fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman and, especially, a lady.

7. The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure, where the father is the head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority automatically, the better. The old-fashioned way has a lot wrong with it. \*
8. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse. \*
9. The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.
10. There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody's being a homosexual. \*
11. It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants. \*
12. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
13. Rules about being "well-mannered and respectable are chains from the past which we should question very thoroughly before accepting. \*
14. Once our government leaders and the authorities condemn the dangerous elements in our society, it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within.
15. "Free speech" means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government. \*
16. Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders, and the normal way things are supposed to be done.
17. In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.

18. Atheists and other who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly. \*
19. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
20. The self-righteous “forces of law and order” threaten freedom in our country a lot more than most of the groups they clam are “radical” and “godless.” \*
21. The courts are right in being easy on drug users. Punishment would *not* do any good in cases like these. \*
22. If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his parents’ duty to get him back to the normal way.
23. In the final analysis the established authorities, like parents and our national leaders, generally turn out to be right about things, and all the protesters don’t know what they’re talking about.
24. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow. \*
25. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps. \*
26. The *real* keys to the “good life” are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.
27. It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change. \*
28. The biggest threat to our freedom comes from the Communists and their kin, who are out to destroy religion, ridicule patriotism, corrupt the youth, and in general undermine our whole way of life.



29. Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents' ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society. \*

30. One reason we have so many troublemakers in our society nowadays is that parents and other authorities have forgotten that good old-fashioned physical punishment is still one of the best ways to make people behave properly.

\* Denotes reversed-scoring.

## APPENDIX C

## HOSTILITY TOWARD WOMEN (LONSWAY &amp; FITZGERALD, 1995)

**Directions:** Please indicate whether you believe that the following statements are **true** or **false** by circling your answer below.

True

False

1. I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.
2. I believe that most women tell the truth.
3. I usually find myself agreeing with women.
4. I think that most women would lie just to get ahead.
5. Generally, it is safer not to trust women.
6. I am easily angered by women.
7. I am sure I get a raw deal from the women in my life.
8. Sometimes women bother me by just being around.
9. Women are responsible for most of my troubles.

## APPENDIX D

## ATTITUDES TOWARD VIOLENCE SCALE (LONSWAY &amp; FITZGERALD, 1995)

**Directions:** Please indicate whether you believe that the following statements are **true** or **false** by circling your answer below.

True      False

1. Violent crimes should be punished violently.
2. The death penalty should be part of every penal code.
3. Any prisoner deserves to be mistreated by other prisoners in jail.
4. Any nation should be ready with a strong military at all times.
5. The manufacture of weapons is necessary.
6. War is often necessary.
7. The government should send armed soldiers to control violent university riots.
8. Our country should be aggressive with its military internationally.
9. Killing of civilians should be accepted as an unavoidable part of war.
10. Our country has the right to protect its borders forcefully.
11. A child's habitual disobedience should be punished physically.
12. Giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble.
13. Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.
14. Punishing children physically when they deserve it will make them responsible and mature adults.
15. Young children who refuse to obey should be whipped.
16. It is all right for a partner to hit the other if they are unfaithful.
17. It is all right for a partner to slap the other if insulted or ridiculed.

18. It is all right for a partner to slap the other's face if challenged.
19. An adult should whip a child for breaking the law.
20. It is all right for a partner to hit the other if they flirt with others.

## APPENDIX E

## RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE (BURT, 1980)

**Directions:** Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements using the following scale:

**STRONGLY****STRONGLY****DISAGREE****AGREE****1****2****3****4****5****6****7**

1. When women talk and act sexy, they are inviting rape.
2. When a woman is raped, she usually did something careless to put herself in that situation.
3. Any woman who teases a man sexually and doesn't finish what she started realistically deserves anything she gets.
4. Many rapes happen because women lead men on.
5. Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.
6. In some rape cases, the woman actually wanted it to happen.
7. Even though the woman may call it rape, she probably enjoyed it.
8. If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was a rape.
9. A rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.
10. When a woman allows petting to get to a certain point, she is implicitly agreeing to have sex.
11. If a woman is raped, often it's because she didn't say "no" clearly enough.
12. Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

13. When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex.
14. It is just part of human nature for men to take sex from women who let their guard down.
15. A rapist is more likely to be Black or Hispanic than White.
16. In any rape case one would have to question whether the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.
17. Rape mainly occurs on the “bad” side of town.
18. Many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and “changed their minds” afterwards.
19. If a husband pays all the bills, he has the right to sex with his wife whenever he wants.

## APPENDIX F

## SEXUAL EXPERIENCES QUESTIONNAIRE (LISAK &amp; ROTH, 1988)

**Directions:** Please provide the degree to which the following statements apply to you using the following scale:

**NEVER****OFTEN****1****2****3****4****5****6****7**

1. Have you ever had sexual intercourse with a woman?
2. Do you discuss your sexual experiences with your male friends?
3. Do you feel pressured by your male friends to be more sexually active than you are?
4. Do you feel that you aren't having sex as often as you "should" be?
5. Have you ever felt while on a date that you had consumed enough alcohol or drugs that you weren't really in control of your actions?
6. Do you ever act on the spur of the moment without even stopping to think?
7. Do you sometimes do whatever makes you feel cheerful—"right now"—even at the cost of some more distant goal?
8. Do you sometimes feel that society's "rules of conduct" are more for show than for any real purpose?
9. Have you ever felt inadequate because you felt a woman was comparing the way you kiss, or your "performance," with other men?
10. Have you ever felt that women sometimes like to act and talk like they were your mother?

11. Do you sometimes feel subtly “put down” by women—criticized or ridiculed in a way that makes it hard to defend yourself or respond?
12. Have you ever felt the urge to assert yourself with a woman because she was getting a little too “pushy,” a little too domineering?
13. Have you ever felt that women sometimes try to make you feel “small,” like a little boy?
14. Have you ever felt that, despite their claims to the contrary, women secretly feel superior to men?
15. Do you feel that women deliberately act seductively toward you—tease you:
  - a. Even when they aren't really interested in you sexually?
  - b. As a way of trying to show their power over you?
16. Have you ever felt that a woman was taking advantage of you by implying in subtle ways that she would have sex with you in order to get you to pay for various things (drinks, entertainment, etc.), but then later refused?
17. Have you ever been deceived by a woman?
18. Have you ever been betrayed by a woman?
19. Have you ever been manipulated by a woman?
20. Have you ever had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because you threatened to end your relationship with her otherwise?
21. Have you ever had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because she felt pressured by your continual arguments?
22. Have you ever obtained sexual intercourse with a woman by making her think that you cared for her more than you really did?



23. Have you ever obtained sexual intercourse with a woman by deliberately getting her too drunk to resist?

24. Have you ever persisted in having sexual intercourse with a woman, without using force, even though she verbally tried to stop you?

- a. If your answer was *anything other than* Never (1), please rate yourself on the following feelings which you may have experienced at the time on a scale of:

Anger	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Need to assert yourself	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Sexual frustration	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often

25. Have you ever been in a situation where you used or threatened to use physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down) to make a woman engage in kissing or petting when she didn't want to?

- a. If your answer was *anything other than* Never (1), please rate yourself on the following feelings which you may have experienced at the time on a scale of:

Anger	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Need to assert yourself	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Sexual frustration	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often

26. Have you ever been in a situation where you tried, but for various reasons did not succeed, in having sexual intercourse with a woman by using or threatening to use physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) if she did cooperate?

- a. If your answer was *anything other than* Never (1), please rate yourself on the following feelings which you may have experienced at the time on a scale of:

Anger	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Need to assert yourself	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Sexual frustration	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often

27. Have you ever had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because you used or threatened to use physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) if she didn't cooperate?

- a. If your answer was *anything other than* Never (1), please rate yourself on the following feelings which you may have experienced at the time on a scale of:

Anger	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Need to assert yourself	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Sexual frustration	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often

28. Have you ever had oral sex with a woman when she didn't want to because you used or threatened to use physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) if she didn't cooperate?

- a. If your answer was *anything other than* Never (1), please rate yourself on the following feelings which you may have experienced at the time on a scale of:

Anger	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Need to assert yourself	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Sexual frustration	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often

29. Have you ever felt the urge to physically force a woman to have sexual intercourse with you even though you did not act on the urge?

- a. If your answer was *anything other than* Never (1), please rate yourself on the following feelings which you may have experienced at the time on a scale of:

Anger	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Need to assert yourself	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often
Sexual frustration	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Often

## APPENDIX G

## DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please read and answer each question as indicated. Print neatly where applicable.

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Race/Ethnicity: (please circle one)

White/Caucasian

Black/African American

Hispanic

Asian/Pacific Islander

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status (Please circle one):

Single

Married

Divorced

Cohabiting

Separated

Widowed

Think back to your childhood, which of the following best describes your family?

Parents Married

Parents Separated

Parents Divorced

## VITA

Gina M. Bondi earned her Bachelor's degree at the age of 20 from James Madison University with honors, *cum laude*, in Harrisonburg, VA in August 2003. She majored in Psychology with a minor in Criminal Justice and volunteered as a counselor for the campus' sexual assault crisis help-line. She also presented workshops to undergraduate freshmen on intimacy and understanding destructive relationships. Also, Ms. Bondi served as a research assistant to Drs. Judith Reifsteck and Richard West.

Upon graduation, Gina M. Bondi was accepted at Old Dominion University as a graduate student in the Master of Science program for Psychology. She completed her first-year research project under the supervision of Dr. Barry Gillen, and she also collected and analyzed her own data, which she presented at the Virginia Psychological Association conference in Roanoke, VA in 2004. Ms. Bondi was then employed full-time as a mental health counselor at Virginia Beach Psychiatric Center, where she gained experience in the treatment of acute psychiatric disorders in adults and children. She began working with Dr. Michelle Kelley on the present research thesis and earned her Master's degree in May 2007. Gina is currently a member of the National Society of Collegiate Scholars, Golden Key International Honour Society, and is an associate member of the American Psychological Association. Ms. Bondi presently works at Green Door, a Core Service Agency in Washington, DC, as a Community Support Worker for the Jail Diversion team.

---

Department of Psychology, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529